07 CIV. 11147 (SAS)(SDNY)

Dear Judge Scheindlin:

I represent the Plaintiff in this action, and the purpose of my letter is to resp request a discovery conference.

As your Honor may recall, this action is a satellite proceeding to obtain security under the admiralty rules for a pending London arbitration. The Plaintiff has already attached \$380,000 at Citibank. At a conference with your Honor on May 28, Defendant's counsel, Patrick Lennon, Esq., said that he also represented the current owner of the vessel (subsequently identified as Blanca Shipmanagement of the Marshall Islands) and that this company wished to move to vacate the attachment of the monies already garnished. The argument is that the ship (the M/T ELLI) was sold last fall and that as part of this sale future earnings of the ship under existing contracts were assigned to the new owner. Consequently, when electronic funds were attached earlier this year, the Defendant had no interest in the monies, which belonged to the current owner. Your Honor set a briefing schedule, with the initial papers due June 27 and my response on July 11.

I said that I would need some discovery to respond to the motion, and there was no opposition.

On May 30 I served a document request, and the schedule of requested documents is attached as Exhibit A. The due date on this request is June 13. Although that is a quick production date, the requested papers are all items that would be easily and readily available in the closing book prepared in connection with the sale.

On June 3 I served a second request, and the schedule of these requested documents is attached as **Exhibit B**. The due date on these items is July 2, as they will involve a bit more work than the first request.

None of the requested documents, in either request, should be difficult for the Defendant to obtain. All of the items are relevant to the issue of whether the ship was sold last fall in a bona fide, arm's-length transaction. Plaintiff suspects that what in fact occurred is that the ship was re-financed and that, in view of the pending disputes with the Plaintiff, the controlling interest took the opportunity to put title in another shell company.

Mr Lennon has objected to the requests as "overly broad and unduly burdensome" and "not tailored to the relevant issues."

On Monday of last week, I called Mr Lennon to see if the matter could be resolved. He said that he was waiting to hear from the client on the issue, but that he should know something further in a few days. I have not heard anything, though, notwithstanding my follow-up with his associate yesterday.

Consequently, I respectfully request a conference with the Court to resolve this discovery issue.

If the Court has any questions, or otherwise needs any information concerning this request, I would be happy to provide Chambers with whatever is necessary.

Respectfully,

John R. Foster Attorney ID: JF3635

Encl.

cc (by fax; w/ encl.): Patrick F. Lennon, Esq. (203) 256-8615 [Southport CT office]

M/T Elli (Our file no. . D247)

Plaintilt's register is granted.

A conference on the discovery

dispute is schoolised to

Nednesday, June 15, 9+

DATE TOUR

Jung of Chundlen